DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 017 CE 047 785

AUTHOR Hale, Charles
TITLE Continuing Education Program Analysis Guide.
PUB DATE 11 Dec 86
NOTE 57p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Continuing Education; Delivery Systems; Enrollment Influences; *Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Needs Assessment; Organization; *Participant Characteristics; *Program Evaluation; Program Guides; *Role of Education

ABSTRACT

This literature review on continuing education and on continuing education organizational structure begins with a discussion of the participants. Participant demographics, reasons for enrollment, and deterrents to participation are considered. The role of higher education in continuing education is described in terms of the role of the community college and the four-year college and university. A section on structuring continuing education covers curricular planning and assessment, curricular design and delivery, curricular areas and requirements, program finance (credit programs, noncredit programs, assessing productivity), program organization (administration, student matriculation, admissions, support services), evaluation, and accreditation. An appendix contains the program analysis guide based on the review of the literature. Sections of this assessment instrument pertain to documenting the support and necessity for a continuing education program, program finance and administration, academic governance, and evaluation (program, faculty, student). (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED284017

Continuing Education

Program Analysis

Guide

By:

Charles Hale, Ed.S., C.H.E.
Doctoral Candidate
University of Florida
Department of Educational Leadership
College of Education

Dr. A. Smith

Seminar: Higher Education Curriculum

11 December 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Hale

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE047785

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Introduction. 2

Who Participates in Continuing Education?

Participant Demographics 4

Credit Continuing Education 4

Noncredit Continuing Education. 5

Reasons for Enrollment 6

Credit Continuing Education 6

Noncredit Continuing Education. 7

Deterrents to Participation. 8

Role of Higher Education in Continuing Education

The Community College. 12

The Four Year College and University 12

Structuring Continuing Education. 14

Curricular Planning and Assessment 15

Curricular Design and Delivery 17

Curricular Areas and Requirements. 18

Program Finance. 19

Program Organization/Administration. 22

Student Matriculation 27

Evaluation 28

Accreditation. 28

References. 32

Appendix A: Continuing Education Program Analysis Guide. . . 34

Continuing Education

Program Analysis

INTRODUCTION

Strother and Klus (1982) have written, "Today's educational systems are being extended: beyond the traditional period of formal education; into adult life, working life, public service, and society at large;... Neither age, locale, nor occupation set limits" (p. xiv). Strother and Klus (1982) went on to label this process of extending education as "continuing education." The results of a study conducted by Wagner (1982) would indicate that continuing education is "big business among America's two year colleges, four year schools, and universities." Wagner (1982) stated that 22,650,000 adult Americans participated in postcompulsory education in 1980. He also reported that continuing education programs carried on by American higher education accounted for 30.4 percent of all postcompulsory education and training conducted in the U.S. in 1980. See Table 1.

Table 1
Postcompulsory Education and Training
in the U.S., 1980 by Two and Four Year Schools

Four Year Schools[a]	Number (1000s)	Percent of Total
Full time	7,900	10.6
Part-time	3,500	4.7
Noncredit	3,100	4.2
Two Year Schools[b]		
Full time	2,000	2.7
Part-time	2,700	3.6
Noncredit	3,450	4.6

[a] Includes universities
[b] Excludes proprietary schools

Source: Wagner, A. P. (1982). Postcompulsory education and training: An inventory of programs and sources of support. Education and Urban Society, 14 (3), 271-300.

To facilitate our discussion of continuing education some common definitions have been proposed. Strother and Klus (1982) defined continuing education as, "organized instruction for part-time students" (p. xv). Currently, continuing education takes two forms, credit and noncredit. For the purposes of this paper, credit continuing education is defined as "organized instruction which may or may not lead to the earning of a formal college certificate or degree but for which semester hours or credits are awarded." Noncredit continuing education is defined as "organized instruction which when completed does not lead to the awarding of a formal college certificate or degree and for which no semester hours or credits are awarded." Accepting these operational definitions, this paper will consider (1) who participates in continuing education programs; (2) the role of higher education in continuing education; and (3) organizational structures for the delivery of continuing education services.

Who Participates in Continuing Education?

In this section we will consider (1) participant demographics, (2) reasons for enrollment, and (3) deterrents to participation. Credit programs will be considered separately from noncredit programs, where appropriate.

Participant Demographics

Credit Continuing Education

Wagner (1982) found that 77 percent of participants were between 25 and 54 years of age in credit continuing education programs offered by four year colleges or universities while 71 percent of participants were within the same age cohort in two year college programs. In terms of race and ethnic origin, most participants were white and were in the upper middle to highest income quartile. Two year colleges tended to enroll more lower income participants than four year schools. In terms of gender, females "out-enrolled" males in credit continuing education programs operated by two year schools by 1.7 to 1. Four year schools enrolled about 10 percent more females than males. See Table 2.

Table 2
Credit Continuing Education
Participant Characteristics

School Type	Characteristics Age in Years				
	17-24	25-34	35-54	55-64	65+
Four Year	17	47	30	5	1
Two Year	22	35	36	6	1

	Race and Ethnic Origin			
	White	Black	Hispanic	Other
Four Year	91	5	2	2
Two Year	89	5	4	2

	Income Quartile			
	Lower	Lower Middle	Upper Middle	Highest
Four Year	7	24	34	33
Two Year	12	29	32	27

	Gender	
	Male	Female
Four Year	45	55
Two Year	37	63

Source: Wagner, A. P. (1982). Postcompulsory education and training. An inventory of programs and sources of support. Education and Urban Society, 14 (3), 271-300.

Noncredit Continuing Education

In a study of 4,631 community services students from six Florida community colleges, Nickens (1977) reported the demographic summary found in Table 3. The participants in Nickens' (1977) study were largely white, between 25 and 54 years of age, female, and married. A study by Welton (1983), found similar demographic patterns except for age. Welton's sample was somewhat younger than Nickens'.

Table 3
Noncredit Continuing Education Student Profile

Age	%	Marital Status	%
<18	4.3	Single	21.6
19-21	5.3	Married	63.9
22-24	9.9	Divorced	9.1
25-34	30.7	Separated	1.8
35-44	18.4	Widowed	3.6
45-54	15.1		
55-64	10.1	Sex	
65+	5.5		
		Female	59.6
Race		Male	40.4
White	86.5		
Black	4.0		
Other	9.5		

Source: Nickens, J. M. (1977). Who takes community service courses and why. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 2 (1), 11-19.

When comparing both credit and noncredit continuing education students, it appears that there are few significant demographic differences, at least as a function of these three studies.

Reasons for Enrollment

Credit Continuing Education

Strother and Klus (1982) described the standard external degrees as "traditional degrees - associate, bachelor's, master's and doctor's - but are designed for part-time students." Modes of earning credits include: credit by examination, tutorials, self-paced learning, transfer credits, experiential learning, and learning contracts (Strother & Klus, 1982). Students enrolled in degree granting programs are most likely motivated by the economic prospects associated with the degree sought. However, this may not be the case with the able elderly as Bass (1986)

points out. Bass has developed a typology of education offerings to older adults which included an education program that "[provided] specialized career training in professional roles for the older person desiring to re-enter the primary, secondary, or voluntary labor market." Bass (1986) went on to describe a program operated by the University of Massachusetts/Boston where elders participated in a career certificate program within the undergraduate program.

Noncredit Continuing Education

Noncredit continuing education programs may award a certificate of completion as opposed to a formal degree. Nondegree curricula may employ a short-course format which might require a residential period or a part-time study format. The part-time study format offers a student the option of taking either a single course or several for personal or vocational development. There is little standardization requirements leading to the award of certificates of completion save where programs are linked to the licensing requirements of a government agency or professional association (Strother and Klus, 1982).

Welton (1983) studied the motivation of 621 subjects who participated in credit and noncredit community education activites. His subjects reported the following motivation factors: (a) fun (89.2%), (b) fellowship (86.4%), (c) learning something new (79.9%), (d) self-esteem (77.6%), (e) leisure (74.9%), (f) hobby (69.9%), (g) physical fitness (68.3%), (h) creativity (68.3%), (i) bored (64.1%), (j) health concerns

(54.6%), (k) physical competition (54.5%), (l) job (38.5%), and (m) college credit (18%). Nickens (1977) reported that his subjects' leading six motivational factors were: (a) improve chances for employment (42.1%), (b) further cultural or social development (38.7%), (c) learn a hobby (33.5%), (d) improve financial planning skills (28.7%), (e) improve consumer skills (21%), and (f) increase understanding of alternative lifestyles (20.5%).

The chief motivators for Welton's (1983) sample were recreational in nature while those for Nickens' (1977) sample were a combination of economic and recreational. The year 1977 was a year of economic hardship for many Americans which may explain the prominent role of economic motivation for Nicken's sample.

Deterrents to Participation

Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984) studied 750 allied health professionals and their continuing education patterns. Using a mailed survey questionnaire, Scanlan and Darkenwald obtained a return rate of 69.8 percent. Using factor analysis, the researchers found six categories of deterrents to participation. These deterrents were: (1) disengagement, (2) cost, (3) family constraints, (4) perception of benefit, (5) perception of quality, and (6) work constraints. Four of the deterrents to participation are clearly programming characteristics (i.e., lack of quality, cost, lack of benefit and work constraints). While the study cannot be generalized beyond the study population,

these data do suggest the types of barriers nonparticipants may encounter which prevent enrollment in continuing education programs.

Using a taxonomy developed by Nickens (1977), Willett (1982) classified the courses in which 427 noncredit continuing education students enrolled as follows:

Community and civic affairs	3%
Family life	27%
Leisure time and recreation	29%
Personal health	5%
Cultural	20%
General career attitudes	12%
Specific career skills	4%

Willett followed these same subjects for five years. She reported that 54 percent of the subjects reenrolled at the two year school (Elgin Community College, Elgin, IL) at least once beyond their initial semester of attendance. While sixty-seven percent of reenrollees attended more than one subsequent semester, 26 percent of reenrollees attended a credit class. Willett (1982) compared persisters and nonpersisters using Nickens (1976) Taxonomuy. Consult Table 4.

Table 4
Persisters and Nonpersisters
by Nicken's Taxonomy

Category	Persisters	Nonpersisters	Total
Specific career skills	94%	6%	16
Cultural	77%	23%	87
General career attitudes	70%	30%	50
Community and civic affairs	54%	46%	13
Leisure time and recreation	48%	52%	126
Personal health	38%	62%	21
Family life	34%	66%	114
Total	231	196	427

Source: Willett, L. H. (1982). Continuing education student flow analysis. Research in Higher Education, 17 (2), 155-168.

Chi-square analysis ($x^2 = 56.04$, $p<.05$, $df = 6$) revealed significant differences between persisters and nonpersisters as a function of initial course enrollment. Nonpersistence was highest in the family life and personal health categories. Willett concluded that Houle's (1961) three categories of adult education participants existed. These three categories were: (1) goal oriented students with clear objectives (nonpersisters); (2) activity oriented students whose learning is not related with announced purposes of the activity (noncredit persisters), and (3) those persons who are learning oriented and seeking knowledge for its own sake (credit persisters).

Analysis of these data suggested that many of the deterrents to participation are the same for credit and noncredit continuing education participants. Other barriers might include lack of support services, eg. student advising or access in terms of site

and time of day (Bass, 1986). By taking steps to remediate these barriers, a continuing education organizational structure can be designed to enable nonparticipators to enroll in continuing education programs.

Role of Higher Education in Continuing Education

The Community College

It is a widely held tenet among community college supporters that community colleges are the peoples' college and as a consequence provide an array of educational services to their communities. One component of the comprehensive community college is continuing education (Fuller, 1979). Lahti (1978) has suggested that community colleges are "seen as offering a quality education at a lower cost and as making continuing education a possibility for all adults in the community." Fordyce (1976) posed the question, "What then is the role and scope of continuing education for the community junior college?" Fordyce answered his own question when he wrote, "we must continue to look at the...student and his characteristics as we fashion continuing education programs...the learner...will use his learning for whatever purpose appropriate for him."

Explicit in Fordyce's statement is the belief that student needs should determine continuing education programming. Based upon Fordyce's definition, the process of continuing education is cyclical and subject to external as well as internal influences. Hence, the need for an organization delivery system that not only provides structure but flexibility as well.

The Four Year College and Univeristy

Queeny (1984) maintained that "universities have both a responsibility and a right to exercise leadership in this area

[continuing education]." Similar thoughts have been echoed by K. Patricia Cross (1981).

Queeny (1984) summarized the role of universities in continuing education as:

> "Universities have tremendous potential to provide meaningful continuing professional education. Such education enhances both the economic and the educational goals of universities. It also offers higher education an exceptional opportunity to serve its students throughout their lives, to enable them to revitalize their knowledge and skills throughout their careers. (p. 17)

The Chronical of Higher Education (1985) wrote, "No longer are they the Rodney Dangerfield of acadame". Mr. Votruba of the State University of New York at Binghamton was quoted as saying:

> "Our marketing skills are particularly useful now that the number of adult and part-time learners is increasing...Recruitment and retention of adult students require a special approach. We understand adult students. We can help our institution integrate adult students into the campus, and we can provide the necessary support services to keep them here." (p. 26)

An analysis of these author comments would suggest (1) universities and by extension four year colleges have a role to play in providing continuing education and (2) the provision of continuing education services will assist learners in accomplishing educational objectives and help the university realize its institutional as well as economic goals.

Structuring Continuing Education

The systems theory as described by Rakich, Longest, and Darr (1985) considers the effect institutional inputs, conversion processes, and outputs, as well as interinstitutional and intrainstitutional influences, have upon the continuing education system. The systems theory provides an all encompassing perspective for interpreting, categorizing, and ordering a continuing education program's component parts together with their attendant influences. Continuing education inputs would be identified as students, student needs, student services, curriculum, faculty, administrative, financial, and material resources. The conversion process is the interaction between inputs and the student, within the institution. Satisfactory outputs would be achievement of student and program goals. In this section, Structuring Continuing Education, we will consider:

- Curricular Planning and Assessment
- Curricular Design and Delivery
- Curricular Areas and Requirements
- Program Finance
  - Credit Programs
  - Noncredit Programs
  - Assessing Productivity
- Program Organization/Administration
- Student Matriculation
  - Admissions
  - Student Support Services
- Evaluation
- Accreditation

Based upon the following review of the literature, the program analysis guide found in Appendix A was developed.

Taffe and Rocco (1981) have defined access for adults to higher education to be more of the character of a civil right

than a social ideal. They suggested that adult access is impeded when: (1) the location or time of program excludes or discourages adults, (2) inadequate financial programative support is provided, (3) support services are not provided, (4) the organizational structure and internal support is not complementary to adults, or (5) the institution promises more than it can deliver. Taffe and Rocco (1981) advise that "each institution must work out its own plan, sensitive to the needs of the adults it can serve."

Curricular Planning and Assessment

Murphy (1981) in describing the campus planning of adult degree programs (and by extension, noncredit programs) outlined four preliminary steps in which the institution should engage:

> "(1) look closely at the needs of the learners, who will be a diverse group; (2) examine the mission and the capabilities of the college and recognize what can be changed to accommodate a new program; (3) discuss the program and its impact on the college as a whole with all of the sectors of the college community; and (4) learn about the market for the program--the buyers and the other sellers." (pp. 7-8)

Murphy maintained that (1) any program which ignored client needs would not be viable; (2) a smaller institution should carefully identify the specific market it intended to serve; (3) an intended program should be in congruence with the college's mission; (4) all segments of the campus community should be involved in planning discussions and; (5) knowledge of the potential market and competition is essential to program viability.

Cole and Cole (1983) developed a process model for inter-agency cooperation which may be used to describe the program planning process suggested by Murphy (1981). The Cole Model is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1.

I. Clientele Identification

V. Evaluation

II. Needs Identification

IV. Action

III. Goals and Objectives

Cole and Cole (1983) outlined several sub-steps under each of the major headings in their model:

I. Clientele Identification
- A. Map Social System
- B. Identify Subsystems
- C. Identify Clientele
- D. Locate Clientele
- E. Identify Leadership
- F. Establish Communication

II. Needs Identification
- A. Macro
- B. Micro
- C. Priorities
- D. Identify Resources

III. Goals and Objectives
- A. Macro
- B. Micro
- C. Short Term
- D. Long Term

IV. Action
- A. Develop Plans
  - 1. Alternatives
  - 2. Activities
- B. Determine Responsibilities
  - 1. Chairman
  - 2. Support
- C. Implement

V. Evaluation
- A. Process
- B. Outcome

According to the Cole Model (1983) an institution should (1) identify its clientele; (2) identify the clientele's needs; (3)

formulate program goals and objectives; (4) implement the program (take action); and (5) evaluate outcome.

In terms of program development, Knox (1982) reported that larger [continuing education] offices were more willing to take risks and initiative in launching new continuing education curricula than smaller ones. The most widespread use of continuing education curricula was to alert participants to new developments in the field and in providing information. The source of ideas for most new continuing education program was the preferences of the faculty followed by participant suggestions and formal needs assessments.

Curricular Design and Delivery

In commenting on program design and delivery, Murphy (1981) suggested three techniques for designing the program based upon the institution's preliminary research: (1) a brainstorming session, (2) a formal committee, or (3) an individual. In terms of curricular delivery systems, Murphy (1981) suggested and commented on five delivery systems:

Delivery System	Comment
Weekend Colleges	Attendance every two to four weekends is sufficient for academic progress
Evening Classes	Usually one or two classes per week is scheduled. Can use clusters for distant learners.

Radio and Television	High production costs usually restrict use to public colleges and universities.
Home correspondence, or Independent Study	Many courses can be packaged this way. Audio and video elements have been used recently. Can provide student support through occasional meetings, letters or telephone calls.
Individualized or Tutorial Study	Intense work with a single teacher.

Weekend colleges, evening classes and correspondence study have been popular and cost effective means of providing continuing education either credit or noncredit. Tutorial study can be expensive but almost always benefits the students. Other delivery systems include single or multiday institutes and on line computing.

Curricular Areas and Requirements

Murphy (1981) reported that institutional pressures would likely advocate for the offering of courses in least demand while the community would request courses in high demand by traditional students. Murphy (1981) went on to suggest three mechanisms through which an institution might configure its continuing education curriculum; (1) modify an existing program; (2) develop a new curriculum, or (3) allow students to design their own programs. Murphy (1981) raised the question, "To what extent are adults in a credit continuing education program required to complete the institution's general education requirement?" According to Murphy (1981) a related issue is, "to what extent

are adults required to complete traditional graduation requirements and how is this to be done." Murphy (1981) also pointed out that alternative credit earning mechanisms are needed for adults who have work or job experience related to the degree sought (eg. CLEP and PEP).

Program Finance

Credit Classes

In most publicly supported institutions, credit continuing education is supported in the same manner for adults as for traditional students. In some cases, as in Mississippi, part-time evening students do not generate the same full time equivalency (FTE) as full time students. This results in somewhat less state funding. In many private colleges, the credit continuing education program is fully self-supporting.

Noncredit

Community college continuing education classes are for the most part self-supporting and usually do not carry academic credit. Breneman and Nelson (1981) in Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective described the financing of this aspect of community colleges as:

> "Current financing practices of the states and localities for noncredit activites are not well documented...if public funds are not forthcoming to support such activities, forcing them to depend on student fees, it is unlikely that they will amount to more than a marginal activity at most institutions...The majority of states appear to make no provision for support of noncredit activities." (p. 184)

Assessing Productivity

Murphy (1981) commented that a credit or noncredit continuing education program's finance requirements would depend upon the institution's budgetary process, size and scope of the program, and the extent to which its establishment and success are a priority within the institution. Murphy (1981) felt: (1) there would be longer delays in securing funding in public institutions than in private ones; (2) a rational program budgeting system must be created and maintained; (3) the nature and amount of student charges must be determined; and (4) access to student financial aid must be established and financial aid parameters developed.

In their study of adult education program costs and finance, Kasl and Anderson (1983) categorized cost information into three levels:

Level 1: Costs directly linked to individual learning activity (eg. instructor salary, materials, travel, per diem, rent for meeting rooms).

Level 2: Administrative (eg. general expenses of operating the department).

Level 3: Overhead resources expended in general program support by the institution (eg. financial and legal services or building maintenance and operation).

Kasl and Anderson (1983) proposed that program costs and income be converted to a common unit which would allow for comparisons. A participant learning hour (PLH) is one learner participating in a learning activity for one hour. Programs with lower costs per PLH would be more cost effective than those with

higher costs per PLH. If income per PLH exceeded cost per PLH, then the program would be generating a profit. Kasl and Anderson (1983) found that continuing education programs operated by colleges and universities generally turned a profit.

In many institutions, the data required to employ Kasl and Anderson's model (1983) is not available. The model proposed by Dickinson (1985) may provide beneficial. Dickinson (1985) outlined the data necessary to calculate indicators of productivity. These were:

Potential Measures of Output Included:

1. The number of courses operated by a program administrator.
2. The number of registrations recorded for the courses operated.
3. The number of student contact hours (SCH = PLH) in the courses operated, calculated for each course by multiplying the number of hours in the course times the number of registrants, then summing the total for all courses.

Potential Measures of Input Included:

1. Full time equivalent (FTE) staff members, including administrators and clerical staff.
2. The net costs of the operation, calculated by adding all costs of instruction and administration, including salaries, office rental, advertising, and other expenses, then subtracting fee income and any other revenues.

Indicators of productivity calculated from the above data are:

1. Number of courses per FTE staff member.
2. Number of registrations per FTE staff member.
3. Number of SCH per FTE staff member.
4. Net cost per course.
5. Net cost per registration.
6. Net cost per SCH.

In order to place the productivity indicators into context, Dickinson suggested that the following descriptive data be provided:

1. Average class size, calculated by dividing number of courses into the number of registrations.
2. Number of SCH per registration.

Using the Dickinson model, the following indicators are made available:

Program Administrators FTE
Clerical Staff FTE
Population base
Registration
Courses
Courses/FTE staff
Registrations/FTE staff
SCH/FTE staff
Net cost/course
Net cost/registration
Net cost/SCH
Average class size
SCH/registration

While the Kasl and Anderson (1983) model differs from Dickinson's (1985), the models may be blended together. This hybrid model would generate indicators of productivity as well as profitability. In his study of continuing education units, Knox (1982) found that, "almost all income was from fees paid by participants [but] most offices obtained some additional funds for new ventures."

Program Organization/Administration

Murphy (1981) identified two organizational models for continuing education programs. He described the largely separate and distinct continuing education as:

> "It probably has its own dean or director, publishes its own promotional literature, conducts its own recruitment and admissions program, keeps academic records of its students, hires its own faculty, and even conducts its own graduation." (p. 20)

The advantages of self-contained units are: (1) quickly and easily established; (2) facilitates innovation; and (3) generally employs a staff sympathetic to the needs of continuing education students. The chief disadvantage is that such an organization may have a narrow base of support within the institution, and hence it may be difficult to obtain help and cooperation from other units of the institution.

The second model described by Murphy (1981) is that of the integrated model. In this model, the continuing education unit is integrated into the organizational framework of the institution and functions as an "ordinary" office or department.

Strother and Klus (1982) described similar models but approached the task of organization from a centralization versus decentralization perspective. The fully centralized model was described as: (1) where the continuing education head reports to the institution's CEO; (2) the section has its own budget and staff; (3) determines its own programming; and (4) has the power to grant academic appointments, rank, tenure, and titles to faculty and staff. The completely decentralized model may be described as: (1) the continuing education director is a staff position; (3) programming authority rests with the residential teaching departments; (3) the continuing education director reports to a dean or other institutional subdivision; and (4)

power to grant academic appointments, rank, tenure, titles rests with the residential teaching departments.

According to Strother and Klus (1982) centralization has several advantages: (1) able to recruit a fully committed staff; (2) has flexibility in budgeting; (3) able to maintain a mission oriented, problem centered, cross-disciplinary operation; and (4) promotes risk taking and innovation. The chief disadvantage of centralization is that it develops an institution within an institution. The advantages of decentralization are: (1) the program is fully integrated into the total academic unit; (2) the resources of each teaching department may be accessible; and (3) there may be incentives for all faculty to participate. With decentralization there are problems: (1) course offerings may be narrower; (2) course offerings may reflect faculty interests rather than clientele needs; (3) loss of budgetary and programming flexibility; and (4) possibility of discrimination between continuing education faculty and residential teaching faculty. Strother and Klus (1982) described the staff function model. Within the staff function model there is: (1) a strong top staff position with control over budget allocations and (2) courses and part-time faculty require the approval of an academic department head or dean.

Knox (1982) found that most of the continuing education departments had a full or part-time director who reported to the dean. Typically, the dean was supportive and allowed the director considerable latitude. Most faculty members viewed

continuing education activities as marginal. Knox (1982) concluded: "In general, most CPE [Continuing Professional Education] offices depended on the flow of support and resources which people outside the office could readily withhold. This contributed to a degree of instability which kept pressure on the director to sustain the effort." The major characteristics associated with organizational vitality were: (1) the quality of educationl leadership; (2) success in obtaining support; and (3) involvemnt of practitioners [participants].

Strother and Klus (1982) listed six criteria for judging an effective continuing education organization. While these six criteria may not be equally applicable to noncredit continuing education, they are generally indicative. These criteria are:

1. The presence of understanding and active leadership by key faculty and administrators;
2. Is there a separate budgetary identity for the unit;
3. Is someone given clear responsibility for the administration and maintenance of the program;
4. Is the program integrated with the total institution (i.e., does continuing education enjoy full academic citizenship);
5. Is the mission statement clearly articulated and reasonable; and
6. Is the program sufficiently decentralized so as to ensure student access?

When developing criteria to aid in the determination of whether or not a structure is effective, one should consider Taafe's and Rocco's (1981) discussion of administrative and organizational characteristics that impede adult access. The criteria should be added to Strother's and Klus' (1982) listing:

7. Does the time and days of class offerings encourage adult attendance;
8. Are adequate student support services provided; and
9. Is the institution sympathetic to adult learner needs?

It is the opinion of this investigator that a determination of program organizational effectiveness rests on the collective answers to these questions.

Student Matriculation

Admissions

Most continuing education students will encounter an admissions process. Murphy (1981) maintained that (1) admissions problems of adults must be identified; (2) procedures should be modified to the extent possible to facilitate adult registration; (3) it may not be necessary for adults to sit for the same standardized examinations as traditional students; (4) open admissions may be appropriate for adults; and (5) the admissions application should be appropriate for adults. Murphy (1981) also raised the questions, "How much influence [does] the adult program director have in determining who can be admitted?" Murphy went on to suggest that: (1) a program orientation be provided; (2) academic counseling be provided; (3) student services (eg. library, learning labs, or placement centers be available); (4) courses be scheduled at convenient locations and times; and (5) faculty should be sympathetic to adult learning styles and nontraditional needs.

Student Services

Strother and Klus (1982) listed essential student services as (1) admissions, registration, and records; (2) financial aid; (3) information; (4) counseling and advising; (5) logistic support - parking, food, lodging, etc.; and (6) library services - eg. tutorial and audiovisual services. Other auxiliary services might include (1) health services; (2) extracurricular activities; and (3) placement. Strother and Klus (1982) further

delineated counseling services into six types: (1) assessment; (2) career information; (3) skill development; (4) motivation evaluation; (5) personal counseling; and (6) advice on academic procedures and requirements. Murphy (1981) concluded that continuing education programs which provide for student services have higher retention and graduation rates.

Program and Student Evaluation

Murphy (1981) outlined a process by which program and student evaluations may be conducted. Student evaluation may be accomplished through the use of standardized tests, teacher-made tests, oral interview, and student questionnaires. Faculty may be evaluated via student performance, student evaluations, peer review, or self-appraisal. Program evaluation may be accomplished by comparing student and/or faculty quality indicators in a longitudinal fashion. Other program evaluation indicators might include (1) a comparison of program accomplishments with earlier goals and objectives; (2) analysis of program-preference information data; (3) analysis of student opinions about the program; or (4) analysis of faculty opinions about the program.

Accreditation

As a general rule, credit continuing education is accredited while noncredit continuing education is not. However, some noncredit programs while not accredited by a collegiate body, are accredited by a professional association (eg. the National Dietary Manager's Association's approval of U. F.'s dietary manager correspondence study course). Mason (1986) in her reivew

of case law and higher education accreditation, reported that in the 1930's the courts held accreditation agencies to be private agencies engaged in a voluntary act and hence removed from judicial review. By the middle 1970's, the courts adopted the posture that accrediting agencies were quasi-public agencies and hence their actions (usually withdrawing a school's accreditation) will be subject to closer judicial scrutiny than in the past. Many credit continuing education programs operate through off-campus clusters within their home state. Such programs share in the parent institution's licensure and accreditation. However, some programs like Nova University operate across state lines anad hence need to acquire a license to operate in a different state. While licensure and accreditation are technically different, it is becoming harder to distinguish between them as the following excerpt from Mason's paper will attest.

> "The latest in the cases involving accreditation and accrediting agencies was Nova University v. Educational Institution Licensure Commission (287 SE 2nd 872 (1984)). Nova, a private educational institution incorporated in Florida sought to operate a doctorate of public administration program in the District of Columbia. In order to do so, Nova applied for a license, as required by statute, and was denied. The University challenged on the grounds that: (1) the District's statute was not applicable to schools like Nova, conferring degrees outside the District; (2) the statute is unconstitutional on its face (to Nova or any conceivable application) because it violated the first amendment; (3) the statute and its regulations were unconstitutionally vague; and (4) the denial was arbitrary, capricious, and unsupported by substantial evidence in the record. The [licensure] Commission maintained that the denial was based on failure to meet requirements for adequate full-time faculty and library resources. The court found in favor of the Commission.
>
> The case listed substantial evidence supporting the Commission's decision. Court records showed the statute to be

very clear, as well as the regulations listing eleven criteria for issuing licenses. The Nova case seemed to rest on the fact that the degrees would actually be conferred in Florida, [and] not the District. It was only operating in or teaching in the area.

In the District of Columbia's statute, it was stated by the court that a license was needed to "operate" and/or confer degrees. Further, that the requirement was reasonable and in compliance with the intent of the legislature. The statute was intended to stop fraud, corruption, and exception by entities that came into the District to set up degree mills, a problem the area had experienced.

Evidence showed that the faculty consisted of nine Florida-campus faculty, and thirty-three preceptors (traveling, contracted faculty). The Florida faculty would provide 50% of the program instruction, but held other responsibilities; were non-tenured, and within a one year period experienced a 50% turnover rate. Nova planned on using the library facilities at two small colleges and other public libraries in the area. The Commission felt this would not be a sufficient degree of stability and continuity for the statute's intent and purpose.

While not holding the Nova program substandard, the [Commission stated that the] deficiencies present[ed] an unacceptable risk that the program would be "substandard" or "transient" or would result in the conferral of "false or misleading" degrees. The courts agreed with the decision.

The courts have demonstrated that accrediting agencies will be reviewed according to aquasi-public standard. With increased reliance on their decisions, the agencies may be classified under a quasi-governmental status based on the state action argument. This would require greater involvement with state and federal governments in functions controlling higher educational institutions. While some would argue that this would threaten academic autonomy and freedoms, others would encourage more state control, through the agencies, to insure quality.

The licensing commission in the District of Columbia acted as an accrediting agency and as an arm of the state, effectively becoming a quasi-governmental entity. If "field programs" expand from Nova and other institutions, it is likely that licensing agencies, statutes, state action, and accreditation will become indistinguishable." (pp. 7-8)

Van Cott's (1986) analysis of the applicable case law agreed with the synthesis presented by Mason (1986). Van Cott went on to write:

> "It may be that external-degree programs are the new wave of the future in spite of Nova University's attempts at implementation. Administrators and faculty in higher education need to analyze the concept of external-degree programs as well as other innovative approaches to higher education; and learn from Nova University's mistakes." (p. 6)

References

Bass, S. A. (1986). Matching educational opportunities with the able elderly. Lifelong Learning, 9 (5), 4-7.

Breneman, D. W. & Nelson, S. C. (1981). Financing Community colleges: An economic perspective. Washington, D. C., The Brookings Institution.

Chronicle of Higher Education. University Continuing Education Divisions: Up from Second-Class Campus Citizenship. 30 (8), 23, 26. August 24, 1985.

Cole, J. & Cole, M. (1983). A model of interagency cooperation. Lifelong Learning, 6 (9), 10-11.

Cross, K. P. (1981). Preface. In Ronald H. Miller (ed.), Providing Access to Alternative College Programs. No City: The Scarecrow Press.

Dickinson, G. (1985). Assessing productivity in continuing education management. Lifelong Learning, 8 (4), 16-18.

Fordyce, J. W. (1976). Continuing education as external relations. Peabody Journal of Education, 53 (3), 151-156.

Fuller, J. W. (1979). Continuing education and the community college. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Hankin, J. N. & Fey, P. A. (1985). Reassessing the commitment to community service. In William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery (eds.) Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Houle, C. O. (1961). The inquiring mind. Madison, WS: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kasl, E. S. & Anderson, R. E. (1983). Understanding program costs and finance. Lifelong Learning, 7 (1), 12-14, 31.

Knox, A. B. (1982). Organizational dynamics in university continuing professional education. Adult Education, 32 (3), 117-129.

Lahti, R. E. (1978). New markets for community colleges. Community and Junior College Journal, 48 (4), 8-11.

Mason, D. (1986). Accrediting agencies and the law. Unpublished paper. University of Florida.

Murphy, L. R. (1981). Campus planning of adult degree programs. In Ronald H. Miller (ed.) Providing Access to Alternative College Programs. No City: The Scarecrow Press.

Nickens, J. M. (1976). A taxonomy for community services. (In New Directions for Community Services: Reaching Out Through Community Services, No. 14, Summer, 1976.) Gainesville, FL: University of Florida.

Nickens, J. M. (1977). Who takes community service courses and why. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 2 (1), 11-19.

Pfanzer, R. G. & East, J. R. (1984). Weekend College: Teaching biology on Saturdays. JCST, 14 (2), 110-114.

Queeney, D. (1984). The role of the university in continuing professional education. Educational Record, 65 (3), 13-17.

Rakich, J. S.; Longest, B. B. & Darr, K. (1985). Managing Health Services Organizations. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.

Scanlan, C. S. & Darkenwald, G. G. (1984). Identifying deterrents to participation in continuing education. Adult Education Quarterly, 34 (3), 155-166.

Strother G. B. & Klus, J. P. (1982). Administration of Continuing Education. Belmont, C. A. & Wadsworth.

Taffe, T. & Rocco, T. N. (1981). Access to higher education for adults. In Ronald H. Miller (ed.), Providing Access to Alternative College Programs. No City: The Scarecrow Press.

Van Cott, M. L. (1986). Nova University's Nontraditional Approach to Higher Education: Innovation or Deception. Unpublished paper. University of Florida.

Wagner, A. P. (1982). Postcompulsory education and training. An inventory of programs and sources of support. Education and Urban Society, 14 (3), 271-300.

Welton, G. (1983). Why people participate in community education activities. Community Education Journal, 12 (4), 20-22.

Willett, L. H. (1982). Continuing education student flow analysis. Research in Higher Education, 17 (2), 155-164.

Appendix A

Continuing Education Program

Analysis Guide

I. Documenting the Support and Necessity for a Continuing Education Program (Credit or Noncredit)

A. Needs Assessment

1. Is the program learner centered, i.e., based on learner needs? Yes No

2. Which of the needs that have been identified can most appropriately be met by the institution?

_____

_____

3. Whom is the program designed to serve?

_____

_____

_____

B. Institutional Mission and Capability

1. What does the institution do well or is well known for? (Identify)

_____

_____

2. Can these attributes be of value to adult students? If so, how?

_____

_____

3. Does the present mission statement encompass the needs of adult learners? Yes No

4. If the present mission statement does not encompass the needs of adult learners, how can it be modified to do so? (Identify)

_____

_____

5. Does the institution have the organizational capability and capacity to successfully support the proposed program? Yes No Maybe If may be, explain.

_____

_____

C. Involvement of Campus Constituencies

1. Have institutional administrators, faculty, and students been involved in discussions concerning the proposed program? Yes No Explain.

_____

_____

2. What is the extent of support or opposition within each of these three sectors of the institutional community?

Administrators:_____

_____

Faculty:_____

_____

Students:_____

_____

D. Knowing the Market

1. What are other colleges or universities within the institution's service area doing to meet the need(s) of adult learners?

Competitor	Activity

II. Program Finance and Administration

A. How is the program financed? Describe.

_____

_____

_____

_____

1. What is the tuition level?

_____

_____

_____

2. What percent of program cost is met by student tuition?

_____

_____

3. Which financial aid programs are available to students?

_____

_____

_____

4. Are adult students able to take advantage of financial aid opportunities? Yes No If no, why?

_____

_____

5. How productive is the program?

1. Background Data

a. Program Administrators FTE _____

b. Clerical Staff FTE _____

c. Population base _____

d. # Registrations _____

e. # Courses _____

f. # Instructors _____

g. Program Income $_____

(1) Tuition $_____

(2) Grants $_____

(3) Contracts $_____

(4) Other $_____

h. Program Cost [Direct + Administrative + Overhead =] $_____

(1) Direct Costs $_____

(a) instructors $_____

(b) materials $_____

(c) travel $_____

(d) per diem $_____

(e) rent $_____

(f) other _____ $_____

(2) Administrative Costs $_____

(a) Administrators $_____

(b) Clerical $_____

(c) Postage, supplies $_____

(d) Equipment $_____

(e) Office space $_____

(f) Utilities $_____

(g) Other _____ $_____

(3) General Overhead $_____

10% of Direct and Administrative Costs

i. Net Profit (or loss) of Operation (Profit) Income-Cost = $_____

Income $_____

Cost $_____

2. Traditional Program Indicators

a. Number of Courses/FTE staff member _____

b. Number of registration/FTE staff member _____

c. Net Cost/Course _____

d. Net Cost/Registration _____

e. Net Cost/PLH _____

f. Student FTE _____

g. Student Credit Hours _____

h. Other _____ _____

6. Does tuition vary according to program cost or is tuition "fixed"? Yes No If program based, describe.

_____

_____

_____

7. What happens to program profits, if any?

_____

_____

B. How is the program administered/organized?

1. Does the institution have a separate and distinct continuing education unit? Yes No Comments.

_____

_____

2. Does the institution have its continuing education unit integrated into the exiting administrative framework? Yes No Comments.

_____

_____

3. What is the character of the program's organizational/administrative structure including reporting requirements?

_____

_____

a. To whom does the chief continuing education officer report?

_____

_____

	Program	Outside Academic Department	Shared	Other	N/A
b. Where does programming authority rest?	_____	_____	____	____	__

c. Who has the authority to:

(1) recruit faculty? _____ _____ ___ ___ _

(2) approve faculty for teaching _____ _____ ___ ___ _

(3) assign faculty to a course? _____ _____ ___ ___ _

(4) grant rank? _____ _____ ___ ___ _

(5) grant tenure? _____ _____ ___ ___ _

(6) grant titles? _____ _____ ___ ___ _

d. Who writes the budget? _____ _____ ___ ___ _

e. Who administers the budget? _____ _____ ___ ___ _

f. Who approves shifts of budgetary resources? _____ _____ ___ ___ _

	YES	NO
g. Does the program enjoy strong institutional support?	___	___
h. Is someone given clear responsibility for program administration and maintenance?	___	___

i. Is the program's continuing education mission statement clearly articulated and reasonable? ___ ___

j. Is there a mechanism for allowing and encouraging student input? ___ ___

k. Are student support services provided? ___ ___

4. Is there a computerized management information system capable of generating data for program management purposes? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

_____

5. Faculty Selection

a. Who recruits, selects (approves), and assigns faculty members to teach courses?

_____

_____

b. What type of faculty members are utilized?

		YES	NO
(1)	part-time adjuncts	___	___
(2)	part-time faculty	___	___
(3)	full-time adjuncts	___	___
(4)	full-time faculty	___	___

c. Is in-service training provided to program faculty on a regular basis? Yes No If so, what type?

_____

d. If in-service training is provided, is it required?

e. What is the mechanism for faculty evaluation, retention, and dismissal?

f. What is the nature of the academic freedom that program faculty enjoy?

g. Are full-time program faculty eligible for tenure? Is so, what are the requirements?

III. Academic Governance

A. The Process for Student Matriculation (Student Support Services)

1. The student admissions process

a. Who handles the program's student admissions process?

b. What are the unique admissions problems facing the program's students?

c. Does the institution's admissions regulations impede or facilitate adult enrollment? Yes No Describe.

_____

_____

d. What is the nature of the evidence adult students must submit of prior academic experiences?

	YES	NO
1. open admissions	___	___
2. high school transcripts	___	___
3. standardized test scores	___	___
4. personal interview	___	___
5. other _____	___	___

e. Can adult applicants be forgiven for poor earlier grades? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

f. Is the institution's admissions application appropriate for adult applicants? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

g. How much influence does the continuing education program director have in determining who is allowed to enroll in the program?

_____

_____

h. What is the quality of cooperation from the admission's office?

_____

_____

2. The student orientation process.

a. Who handles the student "entry" or orientation process?

_____

_____

b. Does the program orientation process help adult students acquire information about the program and institution? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

c. In what form(s) is (are) the student orientation information provided?

	YES	NO
1. Handbook	___	___
2. Tutorial	___	___
3. Video Cassette	___	___
4. Audio Cassette	___	___
5. Newsletter	___	___
6. Class Announcements	___	___
7. Other _____	___	___

d. Is there a mechanism for continuous follow-up information? If so, what?

_____

_____

e. Describe the student orientation process.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. The mechanism for student academic counseling.

a. Is someone available at convenient times and locations (for the student) to provide academic counseling? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

b. Who provides academic counseling to students?

	YES	NO
1. Admissions counselor	___	___
2. program coordinator	___	___
3. faculty	___	___
4. other _____	___	___

c. Through what mechanism is academic counseling provided?

	YES	NO
1. telephone	___	___
2. mails	___	___
3. before or after classes	___	___
4. group counseling sessions	___	___
5. counseling provided outside class meeting times	___	___
6. counseling provided only at main campus	___	___

7. individual counseling session ___ ___

8. other _____ ___ ___

d. What is the mechanism for resolving student complaints/answering questions? Describe.

_____

_____

4. What provisions have been made for student auxillary services?

a. How are student text books paid for and obtained?

_____

_____

b. Are students made aware of what libraries exist in their communities? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

c. Have arrangements been made with libraries off the institution's main campus that would allow adult students to use those facilities? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

d. Are continuing education students allowed to utilize the institution's:

	YES	NO
1. library	___	___
2. learning labs	___	___
3. microfilm facilities	___	___
4. check out library books	___	___

5. health services ___ ___

6. other _____ ___ ___

e. Are continuing education students eligible to utilize the institution's placement services, if any?

_____

_____

B. Curriculum Development

1. What is the approval process for curricular adoption or modification?

		YES	NO
a.	Administrative fiat	___	___
b.	Faculty committees	___	___
c.	Administrative committees	___	___
d.	Faculty and administrative committees	___	___

2. What is the mechanism by which a course or course of study is developed and subsequently approved?

_____

_____

_____

3. Who determines which courses are to be taught as well as when and where?

_____

_____

4. Describe how particular courses are selected for offering?

_____

_____

5. Who evaluates the utility and quality of the curriculum?

_____

_____

6. Are course prerequisites waived for adults? Yes No Describe.

_____

_____

7. Are class syllabi prepared for each course and how long are they kept? Yes No

_____

_____

C. What curricular delivery system(s) is (are) employed?

		Yes	No
1.	Weekend college	___	___
2.	Evening Classes on compus	___	___
3.	Extension (cluster) classes	___	___
4.	Radio or Television	___	___
5.	Audio or Video Cassettes	___	___
6.	Home, correspondence study	___	___
7.	Independent study	___	___
8.	Tutorial Study	___	___
9.	Short Course(s)	___	___
10.	On line computing	___	___
11.	Other _____	___	___

D. Curricular Areas

1. What broad curricular areas does the program include?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Are adult students required to complete general education requirements? Yes No If yes, describe the general education requirement.

Core: _____

Distribution: _____

Integration: _____

E. Earning Credits

1. Are program requirements credit accumulation based? Yes No

_____

_____

2. Are program requirements competency based? Yes No

_____

_____

3. May credits be transferred in:

	Yes	No
a. From other institutions	___	___
b. From job experience/training	___	___

c. From individual study ___ ___

d. From National Proficiency Examinations (CLEP, PEP) ___ ___

e. From experimental learning portfolios ___ ___

f. Other _____ ___ ___

F. Graduation Requirements (If applicable)

1. What are the program's graduation requirements?

General Education: _____

Major: _____

Electives: _____

2. What Degrees or Certificates are through the continuing education program?

_____

_____

_____

V. Evaluation: Program, Faculty, and Student

A. Program Evaluation

1. Are program objectives clearly specified?
Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

_____

2. Is the program attracting the desired audience?
Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

_____

3. Are the curricula areas and delivery systems the ones the students need and want? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

_____

4. How well do student services meet adult learner needs?

_____

_____

_____

5. Are the courses accessible to the adult student?

	YES	NO
a. Adequate in number of offerings	___	___
b. Adequate in frequency of offerings	___	___
c. Adequate in class starting and ending times	___	___
d. Accessible in terms of location	___	___
e. Adequate in instructional techniques employed	___	___
f. Other _____	___	___

6. What is the means by which the continuing education program is evaluated?

	YES	NO
a. Comparison of results with anticipated accomplishments	___	___
b. Faculty appraisal	___	___

c. Student appraisal ___ ___

d. Administrative appraisal ___ ___

e. Program review (internal) ___ ___

f. Program review (external) ___ ___

g. Accreditation (institution's) ___ ___

h. Accreditation (professional) ___ ___

i. Other _____ ___ ___

7. Does the program's evaluation plan contain each of the following?

	YES	NO
a. Demographic and program-preference information for every student	___	___
b. Student evaluations of courses	___	___
c. Regular evaluations of program effectiveness	___	___

B. How is faculty teaching quality assessed?

	YES	NO
1. Student evaluation	___	___
2. Administrative evaluation	___	___
3. Peer review	___	___
4. Self study	___	___
5. Other _____	___	___

C. Student Evaluation

1. Are the standards against which student accomplishment is measured clearly articulated and reasonable? Yes No Comment.

_____

_____

2. What is the means by which student accomplishment is measured?

	YES	NO
a. Teacher-made exams	___	___
b. Standardized tests	___	___
c. Oral interviews	___	___
d. Student self-appraisal	___	___
e. other _____	___	___

3. Are copies of teacher made exams retained by the continuing education program. Yes No If yes, for how long?

_____

_____